



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,673	04/18/2007	Filip Svensson	0104-0597PUS1	2216
2292	7590	10/08/2008	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				BASEHOAR, ADAM L
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
10/08/2008			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/594,673	SVENSSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ADAM L. BASEHOAR	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09/28/06 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 09/28/06 & 12/28/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Preliminary Amendment filed 09/28/06 which claims priority to PCT/SE2005/000462 filed 03/31/05 and foreign priority to Swedish application 0400875-1 filed 04/01/04.
2. Claims 16-20 have been added as necessitated by Amendment.
3. Claims 1-20 are pending in the case. Claims 1 is an independent claim.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 12/28/06 has considered by the examiner.

The information disclosure statement filed 09/28/06 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. In the instant case, a legible copy of the cited foreign patent document WO-02/082418-A2 has not been provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-4, 6-10, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Adobe Systems Incorporated, Acrobat Reader, 1999, Adobe Systems Incorporated, Version 4.0, pp. 1-5 (Hereafter “Adobe”).

-In regard to independent claim 1, Adobe teaches a terminal for navigation documents, comprising:

browser means (Page 1: i.e. Adobe document browsing interface);
pointer means arranged to be controlled by a terminal user (Pages 1-5: i.e. a user cursor to select and move content documents and content selections);
a small-size display (Page 1: i.e. the right document display window);
display means arranged to display a portion of a large size document on the small size display (Page 1: i.e. the partial full size document displayed in the right document window), the area of the complete large size-document being larger than the area of the small-display (Page 1: i.e. as shown by the partial display of document #1’s data); and
control means arranged to form a miniature copy of the complete large-size document browsed by the browser means (Page 1: i.e. Reference #1 shows a thumbnail image of the first document),
wherein the display means are arranged to display the miniature copy on the small-size display in the form of a miniature field (Page 1: i.e. the left side thumbnail display window).

-In regard to dependent claim 2, Adobe teaches wherein the display means are arranged to display the miniature copy in such a way that the ratio between the width and height of the miniature copy is equal to the ratio between the width and height of the complete large-size of

the large-size document (Page 1: i.e. Reference #1 is a thumbnail image of document 1 with a corresponding ratio based on a selected magnification).

-In regard to dependent claims 3 and 15, Adobe teaches wherein the pointer means are arranged to point at any position in the miniature field (Pages 1-5: i.e. shows a user selection via the cursor of different locations within the miniature field), the control means are arranged to register the position pointed by the pointer means, and the display means are arranged to display on the small-size display an area in the large-size document corresponding to the position pointed by the pointer means (Pages 1-5: i.e. shows that based on the location and region selected in the thumbnail images in the miniature field, the corresponding location and region of large-size document was selected and shown in the small size display).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 6, 7, 16, and 17, Adobe teaches wherein the miniature field is movable on the small-size display, wherein the size of the miniature field was adjustable, and wherein the miniature field was scrollable (Page 1: i.e. note the movable scroll bar for the miniature thumbnail field on the right side of the miniature field window; Page 4: i.e. note that the miniature field was able to be expanded by extending the width of said field via windowing functionality in Adobe).

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Adobe teaches wherein the control means are arranged to position a displayed position field in the miniature field in such a way that the position of the position field in the miniature copy corresponds to the position of the displayed portion of the

large-size document in said large-size document (Pages 1-5: i.e. the different reference #'s show a user selected position field in the thumbnail images of the miniature field whereby based on the location of said field in the thumbnail images, the corresponding position in the large-size document was selected and shown in the small size display).

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Adobe teaches wherein the display means are arranged to display the position field in such a way that the ratio between the width and height of the position field is equal to the ratio between the width and height of the displayed portion of the large-size document (Pages 1-5: i.e. the different reference #'s show various user selected position fields of different widths and heights and displaying the corresponding ratio of data of the large-size document in the small size display).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Adobe teaches wherein the control means are arranged to move the position field to any other position in the miniature copy by means of the pointer means, the control means are arranged to register the new position of the position field, and the display means are arranged to display on the small-size display the portion of the large-size document corresponding to the new position of the position field (Pages 1-2: i.e. the different reference #'s show a user moving the position field in the thumbnail image of the miniature field whereby based on the movement of the location of said field in the thumbnail image, the corresponding position in the large-size document was selected and shown in the small size display).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 12, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adobe Systems Incorporated, Acrobat Reader, 1999, Adobe Systems Incorporated, Version 4.0, pp. 1-5 (Hereafter “Adobe”).

-In regard to dependent claim 12, Adobe teaches wherein the small-size display was displayed on a screen (Page 1). Adobe does not specifically teach wherein the display screen was a touch screen. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the display screen of Adobe to have been a touch screen, because touch screens were notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention to provide the benefit of a touch sensitive user input that gave a user increased input functionality and control over a displayed user interface.

-In regard to dependent claim 13, Adobe teaches wherein the terminal is a computer device (Pages 1-5: i.e. Adobe stored and running on a computer terminal). While Adobe does not specifically teach that computer terminal was a telecommunication device, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention for computer terminals to be telecommunication devices (e.g. Internet Access, Email, etc) such that data/information could be

gathered and/or sent rapidly over a distance. In the case, the advantage would be that said Adobe documents could then be transmitted to other devices upon request.

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Adobe teaches wherein the browser means and terminal are used to browse Adobe documents (Pages 1-5). While Adobe does not specifically teach wherein the browser was arranged to browse web pages on the Internet, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention for computer terminals to have browsers for browsing web pages on the Internet for the benefit of downloading and viewing requested data located remotely. Additionally, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have appreciated that there were a plurality of Adobe formatted documents accessible to a computer connected to the Internet and by browsing them, the user would be able to gain the advantage of viewing said specific document format.

9. Claims 5, 11, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adobe Systems Incorporated, Acrobat Reader, 1999, Adobe Systems Incorporated, Version 4.0, pp. 1-5 (Hereafter “Adobe”) in view of Frank et al (US-2002/0171682 11/21/02).

-In regard to dependent claims 5, 11, and 18-20, Adobe does not specifically teach wherein the display means are arranged to display the miniature field on the small-display with different transparency levels. Frank et al teach a method whereby different graphical interface windows were given different alpha values (“transparency”)(Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the miniature field of the Adobe reference to have been given a different transparency level than that of the full size

document window, because Frank et al teach that by "blending" multiple windows with different alpha values, several images can appear transparently on top of on another, which provides the benefit of permitting underlying windows to display data visible to the user through windows which are overlaid above said underlying windows (Abstract). Thus the miniature field of Adobe could be moved over the full size document window and both the miniature field data and the full size document window data could be advantageously viewed.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Please note the additionally cited prior art references on the accompanying PTO-892 form.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178